

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 4-11 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended and claim 11 is added. Reconsideration based on the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. The Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as unpatentable over JP '210; claims 4, 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over JP '210 in view of McCoy; claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over JP '210 in view of Moore; and claims 4, 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over JP '210 in view of McCoy and Moore. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

JP '210 does not disclose a cabinet wherein at least one support, a cap and a side wall of a compressor define and sufficiently enclose an inner space such that the side wall of the compressor is in direct contact with the inner space to cool the cabinet and the electrical and electronic components, as claimed in claim 1. JP '210 also does not disclose a cap connected to a support and a side wall of a compressor such that an upper face of the support, the cap and the side wall define an inner space that is sufficiently sealed thereby to enable the side wall to cool the inner space to a temperature below ambient temperature, as claimed in claim 11.

Instead, JP '210 discloses a protective cover 10 (that the Office Action asserts corresponds to the claimed cap), and a bracket 8 (that the Office Action asserts corresponds to the claimed support). However, the cover 10 and the bracket 8 do not delimit, with a side wall of a compressor, a closed inside space of the cabinet. For example, the cover 10 has an open bottom that is not closed by the bracket 8, such that the cover 10 and the bracket 8 do not delimit, with the side wall of the compressor, a closed inside space. Consequently, the inside space is in direct contact with the exterior of the cabinet, and thus with the ambient

temperature. This results in a thermal equilibrium between the interior and the exterior of the cabinet of JP '210, and thereby prevents the inside of the cabinet from being cooled by the side wall of the compressor. JP '210 is not compatible with smaller and cheaper electrical and electronic components.

Contrarily, the claimed cabinet defines a sufficiently closed inside space that prevents thermal equilibrium between the interior and exterior, enabling sufficient cooling of the inner space by the side wall of the compressor. This cooling improves the reliability of the electrical and electronic components, and the use of smaller and cheaper such components.

Further, even if the bracket 8 of JP '210 does provide some direct contact between the inner space of the cabinet and a few peripheral parts of the side wall of the compressor, these exchange surfaces would be too small to enable the interior space to be cooled to provide for the use of smaller and cheaper electrical and electronic components. The central surface delimited by the bracket 8 (the surface that includes the pins 3) is a heat production surface that is typically at a temperature of 145° C. This production of heat in the central surface is due to an electrical contact exchange and the resistance of the contact between pins 3 and the electrical base 6. Thus, the heat exchange surfaces serve principally for the cooling of the central surface. Consequently, the side wall of the compressor of JP '210 cannot cool the cabinet and the electrical and electronic components. In fact, as previously asserted, the side wall of the compressor of JP '210 does not even directly form a wall of the cabinet.

Thus, independent claims 1 and 11 are distinguishable over JP '210. Further, McCoy and Moore do not cure the deficiencies discussed above. For example, McCoy and Moore do not disclose a side wall of the compressor that is in direct contact with an inner space of the cabinet to cool the cabinet and the electrical and electronic components therein. Thus, independent claims 1 and 11, as well as the claims dependent from claim 1, are

distinguishable over the applied art. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103 is respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 2 and 4-11 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



William P. Berridge
Registration No. 30,024

Eric D. Morehouse
Registration No. 38,565

WPB:EDM/dks

Attachment:

Petition for Extension of Time

Date: November 7, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--